



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/899,711

07/05/2001

Dana Corbo

356543-3

4051

26379 7590 06/15/2009
DLA PIPER LLP (US)
2000 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303-2248

EXAMINER

COBURN, CORBETT B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/899,711 | Applicant(s) CORBO, DANA | |
| | Examiner Corbett B. Coburn | Art Unit 3714 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Corbett B. Coburn. (3) Dana Carbo.

(2) Timothy Lohse. (4) Christopher Kope.

Date of Interview: 12 June 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Langseth.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant describe invention & discussed similarities & differences between stock market & sports books. Discussed Langseth & what the disclosure, taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill. Applicant suggested that Langseth did not suggest a major line mover alert. Examiner urged Applicant to clarify the claims to provide details of applicant's invention. Examiner will consider any amendments & arguments that are submitted in due course.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| /Corbett B. Coburn/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3714 | |
|--|--|